



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/917,070	07/26/2001	Najeeb Abdulrahiman	035451-0140 (3669.Palm)	6244

26371 7590 03/30/2006

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
777 EAST WISCONSIN AVENUE
SUITE 3800
MILWAUKEE, WI 53202-5308

EXAMINER

TRAN, NGHI V

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2151

DATE MAILED: 03/30/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/917,070	Applicant(s) ABDULRAHIMAN ET AL.	
	Examiner Nghi V. Tran	Art Unit 2151	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 February 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-23, 25-36, 38-46, 48-54, 56-71 and 73-96 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-23, 25-36, 38-46, 48-54, 56-71, and 73-96 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 1 and 3-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

3. With respect to claim 1, the applicants wrote "an instruction not to send the electronic data if the electronic data does not have a supported format" (emphasized added). The examiner cannot find any support for this limitation. The examiner considers the "not" as a negative limitation. According to MPEP2173.05(i) "Any negative limitation or exclusionary proviso must have basis in the original disclosure". Since the applicants does not positively describe that not send the electronic data if the electronic data does not have a supported format, the examiner consider the limitation "not" as a new matter.

Art Unit: 2151

4. Claims 3-22 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph because they are directly or indirectly depending on claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1, 3, 7-19, 23, 25, 29-30, 32-33, 35, 38, 41-44, 46, 48, 51, 53, 56-59, 67-69, 71, 78-80, 86, 88-89, and 93-94 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Janakiraman et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0124020, in view of Nelson et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,498,897 (hereinafter Nelson), and further in view of Castell et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0132607 (hereinafter Castell).

7. With respect to claims 1, 23, 35, 46, 53, 67, and 86, Janakiraman teaches a method of transferring electronic data [see abstract] from a remote location [110 i.e. web server] to an electronic device [120 i.e. client] over a bandwidth-constrained connection [paragraph 0009 i.e. wireless devices such as cell phones], the method comprising:

Art Unit: 2151

- selecting electronic data using an electronic device [paragraph 0029 i.e. a user is capable of inputting to client device];
- determining whether the electronic data has a supported format [paragraphs 0015-0016 and item 121 in fig.1 i.e. multimedia analyzer]; and
- automatically issuing a transfer instruction for the electronic data based on acceptability criteria, the acceptability criteria comprising whether the electronic data has a supported format [paragraph 0031-0032].

However, Janakiraman is silent on sending a list of supported formats to a proxy server.

In wireless communication method, Nelson discloses sending a list of supported formats [col.4, Ins.23-26 i.e. MPEG-1, MPEG-2, MPEG-4, H.263, RealVideo, and other packetized forms of digital media] to a proxy server [item 44 of fig.5] [figs.2-4].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Janakiraman in view of Nelson by sending a list of supported formats to a proxy server because this feature enables to select the appropriate format and applications for playback based upon the specific characteristics [Nelson, col.2, Ins.46-52]. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to modify Janakiraman in view of Nelson in order to properly initialize the decoder for the media format [Nelson, col.1, Ins.24-25].

Further, Castell suggests wherein the transfer instruction includes an instruction to send the electronic data if the electronic data has a supported format, and wherein

Art Unit: 2151

the transfer function includes an instruction not to send the electronic data if the electronic data does not have a supported format [paragraphs 0053-0056].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Janakiraman in view of Nelson, and further in view of Castell by sending the electronic data if the electronic data has a supported format and not sending the electronic data if the electronic data does not have a supported format because this feature will prevent excessive congestion of the wireless network [paragraph 0053]. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated in order to stop a flood of unsolicited contentious message to the wireless users [paragraph 0054].

8. With respect to claims 3, 25, 38, 48, and 56, Janakiraman is silent on the list of supported formats is sent to the proxy server upon selecting the electronic data.

In wireless communication method, Nelson discloses the list of supported formats is sent to the proxy server upon selecting the electronic data [col.2, 46-52 and figs.2-4].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Janakiraman in view of Nelson by sending a list of supported formats to a proxy server upon selecting the electronic data because this feature enables to select the appropriate format and applications for playback based upon the specific characteristics [Nelson, col.2, lns.46-52]. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been

Art Unit: 2151

motivated to modify Janakiraman in view of Nelson in order to properly initialize the decoder for the media format [Nelson, col.1, lns.24-25].

9. With respect to claims 7, 57, 78, 80, and 94, Janakiraman further teaches selecting electronic data comprises sending a request to view an Internet web page [122 i.e. web browser].

10. With respect to claims 8, 32, 43, 79, and 93, Janakiraman further teaches sending a request to view an Internet web page comprises entering an Internet web page address in an Internet web browser [122 i.e. web browser].

11. With respect to claim 9, Janakiraman further teaches sending a request to view an Internet web page comprises activating a hyperlink [122 i.e. web browser].

12. With respect to claim 10, Janakiraman further teaches selecting electronic data comprises sending a request to transfer an electronic file [paragraphs 0029-0030].

13. With respect to claim 11, Janakiraman further teaches sending a request to transfer an electronic file comprises issuing a request to download the electronic file from a remote source location [paragraphs 0029-0030].

Art Unit: 2151

14. With respect to claims 12, 30, 42, 51, 59, 68-69, 71, and 88, Janakiraman further teaches the electronic device is selected from a handheld computer, a pager, and a mobile phone [paragraph 0009 i.e. wireless devices such as cell phones].

15. With respect to claim 13, Janakiraman further teaches determining whether the electronic data has a supported format comprises examining the electronic data to determine its format [fig.3 and paragraph 0028 i.e. multimedia analyzer].

16. With respect to claims 14, 29, 41 and 89, Janakiraman further teaches determining whether the electronic data has a supported format comprises comparing the selected data format to a list of supported formats [fig.3 and paragraphs 0031-0037].

17. With respect to claim 15, Janakiraman further teaches the determining whether the electronic data has a supported format [fig.3 and paragraphs 0031-0037].

However, Janakiraman is silent on issuing a transfer instruction steps are performed by a proxy server.

In wireless communication method, Nelson discloses issuing a transfer instruction steps are performed by a proxy server [figs.2-5].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Janakiraman in view of Nelson by sending a list of supported formats to a proxy server because this feature enables to select the appropriate format and applications for playback based upon the specific characteristics

Art Unit: 2151

[Nelson, col.2, Ins.46-52]. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to modify Janakiraman in view of Nelson in order to properly initialize the decoder for the media format [Nelson, col.1, Ins.24-25].

18. With respect to claims 16, 58, Janakiraman further teaches the transfer instruction comprises an instruction to transfer the electronic data to the electronic device [paragraphs 0029-0030].

19. With respect to claim 17, Janakiraman further teaches a transfer instruction comprises an instruction to transfer the electronic data over a wireless connection [paragraph 0009 i.e. a wireless connection is inherent because web browsers may be found on wireless devices].

20. With respect to claim 18, Janakiraman further teaches transferring the selected electronic data in response to the transfer instruction [paragraph 0031-0032 and fig.3].

21. With respect to claim 19, Janakiraman further teaches the electronic data is selected from the group consisting of electronic audio, video, graphic, applet, program, and Internet web page plug-in files [paragraph 0031].

Art Unit: 2151

22. With respect to claims 33, 44, Janakiraman further teaches the source location is selected from the group consisting of a computer, an electronic file server, and another electronic device [110 i.e. web server].

23. Claims 4-6, 19, 26-27, 39-40, 49-50, 73-75, and 90-92 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over both Janakiraman, Castell, and Nelson, as applied to claims 1, 23, 35, 46, 67, and 86, and further in view of Adachi, U.S. Patent No. 6,877,037.

24. With respect to claims 4, 73, and 90, both Janakiraman and Nelson are silent on automatically updating the list of supported formats.

However, Nelson teaches the list of supported format.

In wireless communication method, Adachi discloses automatically updating the list of supported formats to reflect the changes in applications included in the electronic device [see abstract and fig.5].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify both Janakiraman and Nelson, and further in view of Adachi by automatically updating the list of supported formats because this feature allows efficient updating of a number of data modules by sending only one location registration request to the network [Adachi, col.8, lns.52-57]. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to modify both Janakiraman and Nelson, and further in view of Adachi in

Art Unit: 2151

order to receive the copy of the most recent data and the version number from the server system and updates the installed [Adachi, col.1, Ins.65-67].

25. With respect to claims 5, 26, 39, 49, 74, and 91, both Janakiraman and Nelson are silent on automatically updating the list of supported formats after a file compatibility error occurs in the electronic device.

In wireless communication method, Adachi discloses automatically updating the list of supported formats after a file compatibility error occurs in the electronic device [see abstract, figs.3&5].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify both Janakiraman and Nelson, and further in view of Adachi by automatically updating the list of supported formats because this feature allows efficient updating of a number of data modules by sending only one location registration request to the network [Adachi, col.8, Ins.52-57]. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to modify both Janakiraman and Nelson, and further in view of Adachi in order to receive the copy of the most recent data and the version number from the server system and updates the installed [Adachi, col.1, Ins.65-67].

26. With respect to claims 6, 27, 40, 50, 75, and 92, both Janakiraman and Nelson are silent on manually updating the list of supported formats.

In wireless communication method, Timothy discloses manually updating the list of supported formats [see abstract and col.1, Ins.44-64 i.e. manually updating is interpreted as a user-triggered event occurs on the user's terminal].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify both Janakiraman and Nelson, and further in view of Adachi by manually updating the list of supported formats because this feature allows efficient updating of a number of data modules by sending only one location registration request to the network [Adachi, col.8, Ins.52-57]. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to modify both Janakiraman and Nelson, and further in view of Adachi in order to receive the copy of the most recent data and the version number from the server system and updates the installed [Adachi, col.1, Ins.65-67].

27. Claims 95-96 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable Janakiraman, Nelson, Castell, and Timothy as applied to claims 92 above, and further in view of Schwartz et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,473,609 (hereinafter Schwartz).

28. With respect to claim 95, Janakiraman, Nelson, and Timothy are silent on means for filtering the requested electronic data to exclude electronic data originating from an unacceptable source.

In wireless communication, Schwartz teaches means [i.e. proxy server] for filtering the requested electronic data to exclude electronic data originating from an

Art Unit: 2151

unacceptable source [figs.4-7; col.8, Ins.12-67; and col.14, Ins.10-67 i.e. a list of unacceptable source locations is broadly interpreted as a list is not in a pres-chosen item menu].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Janakiraman, Nelson, Timothy, and further in view of Schwartz by sending a list of unacceptable source locations to a proxy server because this feature creates custom channels or filter unwanted source location to save resources such as bandwidth, cache, power, and etc. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to modify Janakiraman, Nelson, Timothy, and further in view of Schwartz in order to filter unwanted source location without burden on a thin device.

29. With respect to claim 96, Janakiraman further teaches the electronic data is selected from the group consisting of electronic audio, video, graphic, applet, program, and Internet web page plug-in files [paragraph 0031].

30. Claims 20-22, 34, 45, 52, 60, and 76-77 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Janakiraman, Nelson, and Castell as applied to claims 1, 23, 35, 46, 53, 67, and 86 above, and further in view of Schwartz et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,473,609 (hereinafter Schwartz).

Art Unit: 2151

31. With respect to claim 20, both Janakiraman and Nelson are silent on sending a list of unacceptable source locations to a proxy server.

In wireless communication, Schwartz teaches sending a list of unacceptable source locations to a proxy server [figs.4-7; col.8, lns.12-67; and col.14, lns.10-67 i.e. a list of unacceptable source locations is broadly interpreted as a list is not in a pre-chosen item menu].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify both Janakiraman and Nelson, and further in view of Schwartz by sending a list of unacceptable source locations to a proxy server because this feature creates custom channels or filter unwanted source location to save resources such as bandwidth, cache, power, and etc. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to modify Janakiraman and Nelson, and further in view of Schwartz in order to filter unwanted source location without burden on a thin device.

32. With respect to claims 21 and 76, Janakiraman is silent on the acceptability criteria further comprises whether the electronic data has an acceptable source location.

In wireless communication, Schwartz teaches sending a list of unacceptable source locations to a proxy server [figs.4-7; col.8, lns.12-67; and col.14, lns.10-67 i.e. an acceptable source location is interpreted as a pre-chosen item menu].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify both Janakiraman and Nelson, and further in

Art Unit: 2151

view of Schwartz by sending a list of unacceptable source locations to a proxy server because this feature creates custom channels or filter unwanted source location to save resources such as bandwidth, cache, power, and etc. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to modify Janakiraman and Nelson, and further in view of Schwartz in order to filter unwanted source location without burden on a thin device.

33. With respect to claims 22, 34, 45, 52, 60, and 77, Janakiraman further teaches the electronic data has a supported format and the transfer instruction.

However, both Janakiraman and Nelson are silent on an unacceptable source location and the transfer instruction comprises an instruction not to send the electronic data to the electronic device.

In a wireless communication method, Schwartz discloses an unacceptable source location and the transfer instruction comprises an instruction not to send the electronic data to the electronic device [figs.4-7; col.8, Ins.12-67; and col.14, Ins.10-67 i.e. a list of unacceptable source locations is broadly interpreted as a list is not in a pre-chosen item menu].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify both Janakiraman and Nelson, and further in view of Schwartz by sending a list of unacceptable source locations to a proxy server because this feature creates custom channels or filter unwanted source location to save resources such as bandwidth, cache, power, and etc. It is for this reason that one of

Art Unit: 2151

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to modify Janakiraman and Nelson, and further in view of Schwartz in order to filter unwanted source location without burden on a thin device.

34. Claims 28, 31, 36, 54, 70, and 87 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Janakiraman, Nelson, and Castell as applied to claims 23, 53, and 86 above, and further in view of Timothy et al., "Web Page Filtering and Re-Authoring for Mobile Users," (hereinafter Timothy).

35. With respect to claim 28, Janakiraman is silent on the information transmission system comprises a proxy server configured to determine whether the requested electronic information has a supported format.

In a wireless communication method, Timothy discloses the information transmission system comprises a proxy server configured to determine whether the requested electronic information has a supported format [pages 534-535].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify both Janakiraman and Nelson, and further in view of Timothy by configured the information transmission via a proxy server because this feature can be providing the transformation services without loss of information. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to modify both Janakiraman and Nelson, and further in view of Timothy in order to conserve wireless bandwidth and device memory.

36. With respect to claims 31, 36, 54, 70, and 87, Janakiraman teaches the information transmission system comprises a wireless network.

However, Janakiraman is silent on information transmission system comprises a proxy server.

In a wireless communication method, Timothy discloses information transmission system comprises a proxy server [pages 534-535].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify both Janakiraman and Nelson, and further in view of Timothy by configured the information transmission via a proxy server because this feature can be providing the transformation services without loss of information. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to modify both Janakiraman and Nelson, and further in view of Timothy in order to conserve wireless bandwidth and device memory.

37. Claims 61-62, 64-65 and 81-82 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Janakiraman, in view of Castell et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0132607 (hereinafter Castell).

38. With respect to claims 61 and 81, Janakiraman teaches a method of receiving information embedded in an Internet web page, the method comprising:

- issuing a request from a portable electronic device to a server [fig.1], the request comprising a command to transmit electronic information included in an Internet web page originating from a remote location [paragraphs 0027-0028]; and
- wirelessly transmitting the electronic information to the portable electronic device only if the information is compatible with the loaded plug-ins [fig.2 and paragraph 0029].
- transmitting a list of plug-ins loaded on the portable electronic device to the server; and comparing within the server the electronic information to the list of plug-ins to determine if the electronic information is compatible with the loaded plug-ins [paragraphs 0031-0037].

However, Janakiraman does not explicitly show the proxy server.

In a wireless communication system, Castell suggests or discloses the proxy server [i.e. wireless gateway, fig.1].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Janakiraman in view of Castell by implementing its on the proxy server because this feature will prevent excessive congestion of the wireless network [paragraph 0053]. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated in order to stop a flood of unsolicited contentious message to the wireless users [paragraph 0054].

Art Unit: 2151

39. With respect to claim 62, Janakiraman further teaches the list of plug-ins includes all operational plug-ins included in the portable electronic device at the time of the request [paragraph 0029].

40. With respect to claims 64 and 82, Janakiraman further teaches the portable electronic device is selected from the group consisting of a laptop computer, a handheld computer, a pager, and a mobile phone [paragraph 0009 i.e. cell phones].

41. With respect to claim 65, Janakiraman further teaches the remote location is selected from the group consisting of a server computer and another portable electronic device [110 i.e. Web server].

42. Claims 63 and 83-84 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over both Janakiraman and Castell as applied to claims 61 and 81, and further in view of Adachi, U.S. Patent No. 6,877,037.

43. With respect to claim 63 and 83-84, both Janakiraman and Castell are silent on automatically updated automatically to reflect changes in the portable electronic device prior to transmitting to the proxy server.

In a wireless communication method, Adachi discloses automatically updating to reflect changes in the portable electronic device prior to transmitting to the proxy server [see abstract and figs.3&5].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify both Janakiraman and Timothy, and further in view of Adachi by automatically updating the list to reflect changes in the portable electronic device prior to transmitting to the proxy server because this feature allows efficient updating of a number of data modules by sending only one location registration request to the network [Adachi, col.8, lns.52-57]. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to modify both Janakiraman and Timothy, and further in view of Adachi in order to receive the copy of the most recent data and the version number from the server system and updates the installed [Adachi, col.1, lns.65-67].

44. Claims 66 and 85 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over both Janakiraman and Castell as applied to claims 61 and 81 above, and further in view of Schwartz et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,473,609 (hereinafter Schwartz).

45. With respect to claims 66 and 85, Janakiraman further teaches generating a list of unacceptable remote locations and wirelessly transmitting the electronic information to the electronic device only if the web page does not originate from an unacceptable remote location.

In wireless communication, Schwartz teaches generating a list of unacceptable remote locations and wirelessly transmitting the electronic information to the electronic device only if the web page does not originate from an unacceptable remote location

Art Unit: 2151

[figs.4-7; col.8, Ins.12-67; and col.14, Ins.10-67 i.e. a list of unacceptable source locations is broadly interpreted as a list is not in a pres-chosen item menu].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify both Janakiraman and Nelson, and further in view of Schwartz by generating a list of unacceptable remote locations because this feature creates custom channels or filter unwanted source location to save resources such as bandwidth, cache, power, and etc. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to modify Janakiraman and Nelson, and further in view of Schwartz in order to filter unwanted source location without burden on a thin device.

Response to Arguments

46. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 3-23, 25-36, 38-46, 48-54, 56-71, and 73-96 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

47. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within


Art Unit: 2151

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

48. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nghi V. Tran whose telephone number is (571) 272-4067. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Zarni Maung can be reached on (571) 272-3939. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


ZARNI MAUNG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Nghi V Tran
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2151